



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

may have partly led me to enter into the copious details and observations, with which I have this day troubled you.

Gentlemen, if you should feel that any of these observations are founded in truth and reason, you will give me, at least, the credit of upright motives for those, from which you may differ. I can have no other motive, indeed, than a hope of doing some public good, by inciting other persons to useful and meritorious actions. Other Judges have very frequently, and with great propriety, charged various Grand Juries upon the general state of this country, its disturbances, and the causes of its commotion, and some of them have ascribed those disturbances and commotions to a general spirit of disaffection and sedition. If I have a very different and far more consolatory view of the same subject, it cannot be improper or unbecoming my functions, to take the like opportunity of stating my judicial opinions, of enumerating the several causes, which in my fixed judgment, have generated those disturbances, and have retarded peace and prosperity in this country; and distinctly pointing out the remedies and correctives, proper for terminating all those mischiefs, and allaying all discontent. These considerations will, I trust, vindicate, as well the motives, as the propriety of my conduct in this respect, through every scrutiny, and against every cavil.

Gentlemen, you will now retire to your juryroom, and there dispose of such bills, and other official business, as shall come before you. Let all your private affairs, your settlements with tenants, your canvassing of freeholders, and such occupations, be postponed to another opportunity. Be punctual and diligent, rather, indeed, for your own sakes than for mine. You will be the sooner released from duty; but, as for me, I must, at all events, remain here during the allotted period of time.

I have addressed you very much at large, with great sincerity of heart, with an earnest desire for your interests, and those of the public, and, I may hope, not wholly without effect.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE EDUCATION OF THE POOR OF IRELAND.

The school of the Society in School-street is now open, for the reception of
BELFAST MAG. NO. LXIV.

young men, properly recommended, who will be taught and trained as school-masters, *free of all expense for instruction.* The Society is not yet enabled, to carry into effect its intended plan, for providing, dieting, lodging, and educating young men, to be sent out *by it*, to act as school-masters throughout the country: but must at present confine itself, to the instruction of such young men as shall be sent to the school. Every possible assistance, however, will be given towards providing proper places, where they may be dieted and lodged, at the expense of those, by whom they shall be recommended, and where their morals shall be carefully attended to.

Those wishing to introduce young men into this seminary to be trained, will be pleased to forward their recommendations of them to J. D. Jackson, esq. Secretary, School-street, Dublin; or to any member of the committee, whose addresses will be found in the report.

PARLIAMENTARY REFORM.

Letter from Major John Gartwright to the Rev. Christopher Wyvill.

(Continued from page 127.)

LETTER XX. AND LAST.

Strike, but hear!

DEAR SIR,—Had a barrister, trammelled in “the narrow rules and fanciful niceties of metaphysical and Norman jurisprudence,”* and under the influence of practice, such as he had witnessed in Westminster, and other great halls; had such a barrister written “Commentaries on the laws of England,” without having discovered that those two goodly personages, our constitution and our “system of laws,” notwithstanding family resemblance, were, in reality, distinct identities, some allowance might reasonably be made for the erring barrister; but when a teacher stands forth, who, unshackled by forensic lore, has freely ranged the fields of a science, human and divine, a teacher, undertaking to unfold “the principles of moral and political philosophy,” to enlighten us on “the elements of political knowledge,” to lay open to our view “the origin of civil government,” to instruct us in “the duty of civil obedience, as stat-

* Black. Com. IV. 418.

ed in the Christian Scriptures," to explain to us "civil liberty," and to bring us acquainted with the unwritten "constitution" under which we live; if such a teacher, I say, professing all this, were in the end to leave us still more in the dark than the barrister had done, what would be his claims on our indulgence?

If a Blackstone, who knew and felt that "political or civil liberty is the very end and scope of the constitution,"* do yet, in speaking of that constitution, utter a word which conveys to him no distinct idea,† it is merely because, as already lamented, he had omitted to ask himself, if the two words, constitution and law, were universally synonymous. But what shall be said of Paley, whose immediate subject was, not "the laws," but the "constitution" itself; if, after all this parade of "principles" of "elements," of "knowledge," and "philosophy," it should turn out, that so indistinct were his ideas, he neither knew its nature, nor even its name.

He calls it the "British constitution;" that is, not the same constitution as that to which our ancestors of Runnimead and the Revolution referred; not that constitution to which our Pym, our Hampden, and our Sidney; our Seldens and our Cokes; our Marvels, our Wiltons, and our Lockes, made their appeals; but a new system of government, taking its commencement from England's union with Scotland.

This appellation, in my humble judgment, in no small degree, prepares the experienced reader for the doctrines that are to follow; for we have long been in the habit of hearing from folly, from faction, and from worse than faction, of a constitution as established at the "glorious Revolution;" and even the nonsense of "the government and constitution of this realm, as by law established," which is the same as to say, a descendant begat his own progenitor.‡ Our liberticides understanding their trade, for ever talk of our "present" constitution, and contend for its being a great improvement on the constitution we had before the borough sys-

tem was consolidated. Lord Grenville calls it "our present system in church and state;" and he further characterizes it as the "present happy system,"* as contradistinguished of course from some one, or more, constitution, or constitutions, under which the nation was miserable. Nay, we have heard it termed, and even within the walls of Parliament, our "Protestant constitution,"† to distinguish it, I suppose, from that Popish constitution, of which our Roman Catholic progenitors, who left us Magna Charta were so proud. The convenient doctrine conveyed through all this jargon, is this, that the constitution is of a changeable nature, to be moulded and modified according to the notions of expediency of those whose legislative influence can introduce new laws and new customs, whereon may be built new notions of "right;" for Paley informs us, that "opinion of right always follows the custom."‡

In this novel doctrine, the liberticides flatter themselves they can make out a justification for so much of their work as by law or by custom they have already effected; and they promise themselves impunity in pursuing their object to its final accomplishment. Blackstone, by his unfortunate notion, that "Parliament can change, and create afresh even the constitution of the kingdom, and of Parliaments themselves," greatly contributed to this mischief. He not only instances, as a change of constitution, the Act of Union with Scotland, but he sees in the same light triennial and septennial elections.§

It is perfectly astonishing that the penning of such a paragraph should not stagger a mind which was conscious that "political liberty is the very end and scope of the constitution;" and lead it to reflect on the absurdity of admitting that Parliamentary authority could be without limits, for he was by no means blind to consequences. "If ever it should happen," says he, "that the independence of any one of the three branches of the Legislature should be lost, or that it should become subservient to the views of either of the other two, there

* Com. I. 6.

† Jones' inquiry into mode of suppressing riots, II.

‡ App. Civ. and Mil. on the Eng. Con. 42.

* Morn. Chron. 31 May, 1799, Also App. Civ. and Mil. on Eng. Con. 43.

† The Comparison, 1810, p. 78.

‡ II. 125.

§ I. 51.—App. Civ. and Mil. on Eng. Con. 45.

would soon be an end of our constitution ;” * and he adds these remarkable words : “ the Legislature would be changed from that which was originally set up by the general consent and fundamental act of society ; and such a change, however effected, is, according to Mr. Locke, at once an entire dissolution of the bands of government ; and the people are thereby reduced to a state of anarchy, with liberty to constitute to themselves a new legislature.” †

In commenting on the words of statesmen by profession, we see how flexible a thing, in their hands, the English constitution is, and how it is made to blow hot, and to blow cold ; so as to answer purposes as opposite as the poles.

During the reign of terror in 1799, as on a former occasion I have observed, Lord Grenville, echoing Mr. Pitt, stoutly maintained, that “ the Parliament and the King have a right to change the constitution ; ‡ opinion of right,” says Paley, “ always follows custom.”

But when in May, 1799, it had been his Lordship’s object to avert from the rotten boroughs the stroke of reform, he as stoutly asserted, that “ to take away the elective franchise, is a violation of fundamental rights, which the two Houses of Parliament were not competent to exact, and to which the King could not give his assent.” § So far, indeed, I will side with his Lordship against certain extinguishers of rotten boroughs, as to remark, that the proper work of reform is not to “ take away” franchise, but merely to break through the monopoly which stands in the way of fair representation.

It has been repeatedly established as truth, that the legislature, which is a mere trustee, acting by delegation, is so far from having authority to “ change the constitution,” that, on the contrary, “ the constitution is a law to the legislature ; a limit which that legislature is never to pass ; a criterion of political rectitude, and on all occasions an indispensable rule of government.” ¶ *Magna Charta and the Bill of*

rights did not change, but declare the constitution ; by the triennial and septennial bills it was not changed, but violated and insulted ; even at the Union, the constitution was not changed, but had precisely the same existence and definition after as before.” Scotland merely agreed to take the benefit of so much of the English constitution and law, as on stipulation she chose to have ; without surrendering more of her own than she chose to part with.

Paley, therefore, in talking of a “ British constitution,” is brought into this dilemma, that he was either ignorant of the constitution of his country, or, by indirectly inculcating the doctrine of a right in the legislature to change it at their discretion, he was laying foundations for any such inroads on it, as the legislature, or rather the few, or the one, who may be able to influence its decisions, may at any time think fit to make.

To place, however, the authority of Paley, as a writer on the constitution, at once in a decisive point of view, be it remarked, that it has been stated, and not without ample proof, that “ the English constitution is, in fact, a two-fold and admirable system of civil and military polity most happily combined ; whereby these two characters, like the faculties of intellectual ability and bodily force in man, are inseparably interwoven, to constitute a complete state, or free government ” †

The evidence of the martial moiety of this twofold system, lies on the very surface of our history ; it pervades all our law books ; it was admirably illustrated in 1757, by the late Earl of Liverpool ; ‡ it had again, in 1780, its legal form and lineaments, its profound wisdom and perfections, placed in a focus of light, by that incomparable scholar and genuine patriot, Sir William Jones ; § it made, moreover, the subject of another distinct treatise, entitled “ *England’s Ægis ; or, the Military Energies of the Constitution ;*” besides which, in consequence of the infamous riots in London, in 1780, and at Birmingham, in 1791, the very statutes which are declaratory of it, were acted upon, as they have been since, in our courts of law ; and yet, after these proofs of its existence, Paley, in his delineation

* I. 51.—App. Civ. and Mil. on Eng. Con. 45.

† *Ibid.*

‡ *Courier*, 20th March, 1799.—Ap. Civ. and Mil. on Eng. Con. 292.

§ *Morning Chronicle*, 31st May, 1797. Ap. 44.

¶ *Appeal to the Nation*, 1812, p. 2.

* See the definition in my last Letter.

† App. Civ. and Mil. on Eng. Con. V.

‡ *Disc. on Nat. and Const. Force.*

§ *Leg. means of Supp. Riots.*

of our polity, says not, on this essential part of it, a single syllable, although "of war and military establishments" we have an entire chapter.

Of this martial moiety of the constitution of England, which is "as essential to our liberties, as legislative representation itself,"* this political philosopher seems to know no more, than of what passes in the moon. Here we find a shallow libeller and a superficial panegyrist, a Paley and a De Lolme, on the same level. It is such "political knowledge," such an acquaintance with that constitution he undertakes to define and to explain, for which Paley's work is made an examination book for degrees, at that learned University in which you formerly studied? Is it for such an excellence, it is almost universally put, at our other University, into the hands of students, by their college tutors? Fortunately for the rising generation in Spain, they will be called on, in all the "Universities and Literary Establishments where the Ecclesiastical and Political Sciences are taught." In their regenerated state, to read and to study the real constitution of their country, and not a substituted forgery, foisted on them by any wolf in sheep's clothing!

Ordinary politicians, who bear about them the infirmities of our nature, with weak notions and feelings, which have taught them to set a value on liberty, have hitherto apprehended no small evil from standing armies, and have accordingly been partial to militias; but our philosopher, far above all such weaknesses, as free from valuing liberty as from an affectation of it, has a contempt of militias, and an admiration of standing armies, in which no monarch ever surpassed him; and in which some of them, content that their mercenaries overbalanced their militias, as old Frederic of Prussia, and others, have fallen considerably short of this English minister of the gospel.

With Paley it goes for nothing, that "our laws and constitution know no such state as that of a perpetual standing soldier;"† with Paley it goes for nothing, that the *proper* militia of England, with which her King once performed miracles of police, and, of defensive war, is a system which, on the true principles of order, bond of all society, and by a beautiful, re-

finied, yet simple mechanism, organizes a community of free citizens into an invincible army; that it is a system of which equal liberty is the inspiring soul, and general liberty the happy result.*

With Paley it goes for nothing, that such men as Machiavelli, Bacon, Harrington, Temple, Fletcher, Burnet, Trenchard, Sidney, Swift, Liverpool, Jones, with others of great names, and in great numbers, have warned us against standing armies, and have commended militias. With Paley it goes for nothing, that Aristotle saw that "he who commands the arms of a country is master of its liberties, and can, at his pleasure, pervert or subvert its most sacred institutions."† With Paley it goes for nothing, that "where government only is armed, there despotism is established," as our cotemporary, Mr. Arthur Young, has observed.‡ With Paley it goes for nothing, that the sagacious Hume pronounced the standing army "a mortal distemper, of which our constitution must inevitably perish."§ With Paley, that phenomenon, (as unique in effect, as the deluge in fact,) that a standing army, wherever introduced, has invariably destroyed liberty, likewise goes for nothing. In the teeth of all this testimony, in contempt of all these authorities, Paley unblushingly inculcates the use of a standing army exclusively, bestowing on it the most lavish encomiums. Conscious of the odious office he was performing, he closes his warm panegyric with a bare cold admission, that "its aspect is in no wise favourable to public liberty;" but he is careful to palliate this admission, by insinuating how, by the good policy of our rulers, this danger is "diminished."

Is it for his laboured eulogium on that "mortal distemper" which, wherever communicated, proved fatal to liberty, that Paley's book is so carefully put into the hands of all the English youth of family and fortune, in those seminaries of learning where our clergy, our magistrates, our lawyers, and our legislators, receive their education? Was it for thus clandestinely secreting from the inquisitive eye of the ingenuous student, at the very period for good impressions, that half of our "two-fold polity," that "vital branch of our

* Appeal to the Nation in 1812, p. 12.

† Black. Com. I. 408.

* App. Civ. and Mil. on Eng. Con. IV.

† Polit. VII. 9.

‡ Travels, 550.

§ Essays, II. 376.

constitution,"* by means of which its organizer immortalized his name and nation;† which a Jones, "the most enlightened of the sons of men,"‡ thought worthy of being "restored to full vigour and energy," and, in a rich gem of legal learning, led the way in that generous labour; was it, I say, for thus defrauding youth of knowledge the most important, that Paley's book was selected for academical instruction in "moral and political knowledge!"

In delivering without reserve my sentiments on standing armies, I speak not against the necessary, but the unnecessary, use of them: nor am I a factious grumbler at an evil, without proposing a preventive, and showing a remedy.

Although, as well as Hume, I know such an army to be a "distemper," I believe, I am the only state physician who has shown how to prevent its being "mortal;" and how a great standing army is to be reconciled with the jealous securities of liberty.—"Here is the solution of that problem of politics, that has filled the head of the philosopher with prophetic visions of slavery, and the heart of the depending patriot with the deep-seated anxiety."§

Paley, by excluding all collateral considerations, and shutting his eyes against all the grand principles of free government, endeavours, by a sophistical dexterity in wordy argument to establish this monstrous paradox, that political economy is one of the benefits of employing standing armies; which, says he, "provide for the public service at the least possible expence." By selecting cases which are exceptions to general truths, either this, or any other proposition else, may be proved. On the other side of the question, we have the opinion of Lord Liverpool (no mean political economist) who grounding his comparison on the particular case of defence, observes, that "regular force will surpass a militia in expence by almost twenty times the sum." In the *Ægis*, it is demonstrated, that, if our island were to experience formidable invasion, and defence were attempted by a standing army to the exclusion of a militia, after an expence exceeding tenfold

the calculation of Lord Liverpool, such a defence must also cost us our country into the bargain.

Paley has taken good care, that in his book we shall not find a certain opinion, which has been very prevalent among truly "moral and political philosophers," those especially who have drank the deepest at that pure fountain of wisdom, "the Christian Scripture," namely, that the existence of standing armies, the known "origin of taxes levied at the pleasure of the monarchs, and enabling them to survey in mockery the rights and pretensions of their subjects," has, more than all other motives put together, been the great generating cause of modern wars. It is with this consideration in his contemplation a political economist must calculate the expence of standing armies. Here, here we shall find the cause of that expence, which has laid on us a crushing debt, fast approximating to a *thousand millions sterling*! Without a standing army, more than could have garrisoned here and there a commercial fort on a foreign coast, it is true that a company of London merchants would not now have been the despotic masters of sixty or seventy millions of crouching Asiatics; but the English nation might have been free, prosperous, and happy, without its soil being mortgaged for a single farthing.

But let us return to our "moral and political" Mr. Paley.

Those who, without being well assured of the justice of a war, engage therein as soldiers, may, by some scrupulous persons, be thought to have acted without due consideration. Wherefore, to ease, as it should seem, the consciences of the military class, Paley begins his chapter of "War and Military Establishments," in rather a singular manner. Among other arguments, our philosophical divine observes, that, although wars be ascribed by Saint James to lawless and malignant passions, and be one of the sorest calamities with which a land can be visited, yet the profession of a soldier is "no where forbidden in Scripture;" which is one of the two reasons assigned by the reverend the Ordinary of Newgate to Mr. Jonathan Wild the Great, when under sentence of

* App. to the Nation, 1812, p. 11.

† Ib. 12.

‡ Johnson.

§ App. to the Nation in 1812, p. 8. 13.
See also the whole of England's *Ægis*.

* Stuart's View of Society in Europe, 153.—App. Civ. and Mil. on Eng. Con. 203.

† Fielding, xii. 231.

death, for his readiness to drink with him a bowl of punch; since, besides being wholesome for the gravel, "it is nowhere spoken against in Scripture."

Agreeing with Blackstone in "thinking it an undeniable position, that a competent knowledge of the laws of that society in which we live, is the proper accomplishment of every gentleman and scholar;" and in the highest degree admiring the wisdom of the Spanish Cortes, in following "the example of ancient Rome, where the very boys were obliged to learn the twelve tables by heart, as *carmen necessarium*, or indispensable lesson, to imprint on their tender minds an early knowledge of the laws and constitution of their country*." It is my wish, as far as lies within the compass of a letter, to inquire into the title of Paley to be the "political" mentor, in our two Universities, of every rising generation of English noblemen and gentlemen successively.

Let us, therefore, see what he says on our constitution itself. It is this: In England, the system of public jurisprudence is made up of Acts of Parliament, of decisions of courts of law, and of immemorial usages, consequently *these are the principles* of which the English constitution itself consists, the sources from which all our knowledge of its nature and limitations is to be deduced, and the authorities to which all appeal ought to be made, and by which every constitutional doubt and question can alone be decided. This *plain and intelligible* definition is necessary to be preserved in our thoughts.†

How exquisite, how divine, how instructive, this paragon of definitions! With what raptures must it have been received by the mathematical Caput of mathematical Cambridge! As a master of "Elements," hide, O Euclid, thy diminished head! As a teacher of "*Principia*" learn modesty, Newton; the palm belongs to thrice-luminous Paley! And resign, O half-learned Locke, the wreath of "political knowledge," to this superior! Having, however, indulged in this slight of admiration, let us now condescend to count over actual gains in the political science, from the instructive definition of this philosopher and logician.

His chapter of "*The British Constitution*" had begun with this proposition: that "the

constitution of a country is so much of its law as relates to its legislature and its courts of justice." But he no sooner gets us into *England* (for he now forgets his British constitution, (than he tells us quite another story. To enforce and to illustrate that first proposition, he had immediately repeated its meaning, though with no very remarkable accuracy, in another form of words, namely, "The constitution is one principal division, section, or title of the code of public laws; distinguished from the rest only by the superior importance of the subject of which it treats." But, as already noticed, the moment he gets us into "*England*," he is in another tale. His definition of "the Constitution of a country," which too much resembled that given in my last letter, would not, it seems, on mature consideration, do for England.

Attending, therefore, to the *plain* and *intelligible* definition which, on correcting himself, he gave us of the English constitution, we find that the very principles of it consists in thousand upon thousands of statutes, together with the entire mass of our unwritten law, besides the innumerable decisions of our law courts. What, in nature can be more "*plain*?" What more *intelligible*? To comprehend, indeed, such a constitution, may require a little patience to be sure. *Viner's Abridgment* did not cost him much more than fifty years. Could but eight or nine *Viner's* in succession devote to the compilation their indefatigable labours, each for an equal space of time, perhaps we might behold the whole of that constitution of which Paley has given his "*plain and intelligible* definition; unless, indeed, its future annual growth should henceforward continue to be as of late years it has been, in a geometric, instead of an arithmetic proportion, it which case it might require either more hands or more time. Of such a constitution, what a "distinct idea" must every Englishman have! What a guide in argument, what a criterion in legal or parliamentary debate, much such a constitution prove!

I had several years ago occasion to comment on the notions of certain counter-petitioners against Parliamentary Reform, whose view of the constitution, as general among the liberticides, was the same as Paley's. A chameleon constitution that changed its colour, nay, its very identity; with every new statute, I thought a most whimsical thing; a hotch-potch of discordancies and contradictions, a medley of im-

* Cic. De Legg, 23.—Black. Com. I. 5.

† II. 191.

numerable items, among which old rags, kettles and frying-pans, were as essential ingredients, as the jurisdiction of law courts, the offices of Parliament, or the inheritance of the Crown, appeared to me too absurd, to be held up as that constitution on which our liberties and happiness depend.

To drop, however, all jocularities on so very serious a matter, "this plain and intelligible definition" of Paley once more exposes the ignorance of that empty pretender to "political knowledge." Of the morality of the gentleman I say nothing; but I ask if it be possible, that such political definitions and doctrines as those of Paley can be gravely taught, and gravely studied, at Cambridge and at Oxford? Were it not for that consideration, the task of criticising such trash would be too disgusting. In hastening to an end, I will therefore, barely touch on his notions of "*Civil Liberty*," of the "*Origin of Civil Government*," and of the "*Duty of Submission*."

According to Paley, "civil liberty is the not being restrained by any law, but what conduces in a greater degree to the public welfare." This is not "liberty," but, at the best, mere legal protection; such as was enjoyed under the more wise and benevolent of the despotic Roman Emperors; and such as may be enjoyed by the slaves of any arbitrary monarch. Having thus shown what is not, "civil liberty," I proceed to shew what is. "Civil liberty is the condition of a people who live under laws made by themselves, either in person or by representatives, whom they have chosen, and authorized to legislate, for a term not exceeding one year."

The last member of this definition, needs for its proof but a single link of reasoning; which link has already appeared in these letters; all the rest is self-evident; as likewise is the negation; for to live under laws made without our consent, is slavery. In a notion of "liberty," without consent, in contempt of all Paley's sophistry, there "is a defect, which no arguments can excuse or supply."

But what has Paley, who talks not of just government, of free government, but only of civil government, whatever be its construction, whether monarchical, aristocratical, or aught else on earth, save par-

taking of democracy, to do with "liberty?" It makes no part of his system; and to eradicate it from ours, seems the main drift of his morality and philosophy.

"Slavery is so vile and miserable an estate of man, and so directly opposite to the generous temper and courage of our nation, that it is hardly to be conceived that an Englishman, much less a Gentleman, should plead for it."—Thus began the celebrated "*Treatise of Government*," written by the "*venerable Locke*," as our priest, while in open hostility against his eternal truths, by senseless sophistry, is pleased to style him. Locke, by resistless reasoning, first exposed the egregious nonsense of Sir Robert Filmer, for supporting arbitrary dominion, by inheritance from Adam, as well as by divine right; and proved, incontestably, that all government, to be just, must be by common consent, agreeably to Bracton. In the course of his argument, and merely for illustration, he uses, and with the soundest sense, the word "compact;" merely equivalent to saying, that just government must accord with the principles of the law of nature; "from which human laws derive all their force, and all their authority."

Now Paley having, as it should seem, determined at all events to enter the lists as an opponent of Locke; but remarking the error of Filmer, in attempting to establish his doctrines by particulars, that fill a large book, he, for a similar purpose, more sagaciously confined himself to *generals*; by which in the short compass of eight octavo pages of large print, he gallops to the conclusion, "that the earliest Governments were monarchical; because the government of families and of armies, from which civil government derived its institution, and probably its form, is universally monarchical;"† and here he chooses to leave the foundations of "civil government."

Much need not be said on his account of the means by which "subjection to civil government is maintained," although it depend on "the will of a child, a woman, a driveller, or a lunatic."‡ His ground of authority, is "prescriptions;"§ his means of enforcement, "standing armies." For explaining "the duty of submission

* II. 136.

• Black Com. I. 4L

† II. 119.

‡ II. 120.

§ II. 121.

to civil government," after much cavil at the doctrine of a "compact," as never having, in reality, existed; and a most jesuitical endeavour even to deny the application of that doctrine "to the establishment of the United States of North America,"* although "as a fact," that grand event stared him in the face, compelling him to notice it: he proceeds to say, "wherefore, rejecting the intervention of a compact, (that is, rejecting all notion of justice, and of those principles of the law of nature on which political liberty depends,) as unfounded in its principle, and dangerous in its application, we assign for the only ground of the subject's obligation, the *will of God*, as collected"—from what, think you?—"from expediency."†

Here, again, this great teacher of "political knowledge," is just as "plain and intelligible," as in his definition of the Constitution. Such politicians as Locke, acknowledging the Deity as the author of nature and the creator of man; and, consequently, deriving from Him the law of nature, and human reason; they, by the exercise of their reason, endeavour to explain that law, for inculcating "political knowledge." To this end, they, in the first place, set forth those principles of that law which are self-evident; from these, in the second place, they deduce other principles, requiring but the simplest steps of ratiocination for their establishment. On these, again, they build their undeniable maxims; and thus proceeding, as the geometers, from the simplest elements, build demonstration on demonstration, they lay the foundation, and carry up the superstructure of all their political reasoning. And thus, as far as human faculties are competent, they are enabled, in all that is essential to "the happiness of human life,"‡ so far as that happiness depends on good government, to "show specifically what is, "the will of God," which Paley does not. The difference, therefore, between Paley and such writers is this: Paley tells us, that this "happiness of human life," is a fruit produced by a tree of "political knowledge," growing in a certain part of an intellectual region; to which "the will of God" is to be our guide;

and that "every man for himself,"* whether he can or cannot find either the region or the guide, must work his way as he can. The politicians, to whom Paley has opposed himself, act very differently. Having themselves traversed the region in question, by the aid of the guide above-mentioned, and having made a plan of the country, on which they have carefully delineated the right road, distinctly marking the first entrance, and then every successive stage, they, as faithful friends and honest counsellors, lay all this fairly before us.

Now, wherefore these different modes of conduct? In answer to this question, I confess that I can discover no other reason, than that one leads to slavery, the other to liberty. The enemies of liberty seek darkness rather than light: its friends, at all times, pray for the illumination of truth, divine emanation from the fountain of light! Self-evident principles of reason, being equally criteria of good and of bad government, they, on one hand, favour justice and good government; while on the other hand, they expose injustice and oppression. Knowledge not only promotes union, but instructs how to obtain a redress of grievances. Paley, therefore, is for veiling "the will of God" in a mysterious, oracular darkness, to be only occasionally interpreted, as convenient to the high authorities of "civil government," by a political priesthood in the pay of those authorities. That he is for keeping the people in "ignorance," for the direct purpose of preventing "union," he unblushingly avows. "As this ignorance of union," says he, "and want of communication, appear among the principal preservatives of civil authority, it behoves every state to keep its subjects in this want and ignorance."‡ Such, O venerable Locke, is thine opponent!

Now, leaving the author of "the Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy," as a defender of the rotten boroughs, and even a champion for Parliamentary corruption, where I found him, namely, in the hands of the author of "Letters to William Paley,"|| &c. who, in that part of his conduct, has given a good account of him. I remain, dear sir, truly, your friend and servant,

JOHN CARTWRIGHT.

* Black Com. II. 132.

† II. 141.

§ II. 142.

* Black Com. II. 143.

† II. 127.

Said by Johnson.

RETURN OF THE POPULATION OF THE COUNTY ARMAGH, 1ST AUGUST, 1814.

<i>Baronies.</i>			
Armagh.....	32709	Lurgan.....	2207
Upper Orier.....	24104	Portadown.....	867
Lower Orier.....	19864	Richhill.....	734
Omishland West.....	35160	Tandragee.....	1091
Omishland East.....	15509	Pointzpass.....	379
Upper Fews.....	19617	Newtownhamilton.....	696
Lower Fews.....	17284	Keady.....	593
Turansny.....	13957	Blackwatertown.....	507
Total of the County.....	176,213	Middletown.....	459
		Charlemont.....	446
		Killalea.....	439
		Markerhill.....	428
		Balleek.....	304
		Loughgall.....	365
		Forkill.....	254

Principal Towns in the County.

Armagh.....	5594
Part of Newry.....	2279

RETURN OF THE POPULATION OF THE COUNTY FERMANAGH.

Baronies.	Employed in Agriculture.	Employed in Trade Manufactures, &c.	Not comprised in the preceding classes.	Males.	Females.	Total.
Lurg.....	2769	392	360	9493	9903	19,396
Magneraboy.....	2910	213	119	3593	9556	18,149
Lyrkenedy.....	2823	533	43	8682	9591	18,083
Magherastaphena.....	1812	686	610	7328	8970	16,698
Glenawly.....	2158	190		7003	6983	13,941
Clonkelly.....	1690	139	6	5021	5198	19,219
Knockninny.....	1151	74		3895	4159	8054
Coole.....	1075	95	21	3254	3456	6710
General Total.....				111,250		

At a Meeting of the Friends of Civil and Religious Liberty and of Internal Peace and Concord, assembled from various places, and held in the centre room of the White Linen-Hall in Belfast, the 19th of September, 1814,

ROBERT TENNENT in the Chair.

Resolved, That as the evils of the Orange system still remain unabated, we will renew our Petitions to both Houses of Parliament in the ensuing session.

Resolved, That a draft of the Petition now produced, be adopted; and that applications be made throughout the country, to obtain a general co-operation in procuring signatures.

Resolved, That John Hancock having

BELFAST MAG. NO. LXXIV.

offered a renewal of his services, for the purpose of managing the correspondence connected with the Petitions, he is continued as our Secretary.

Resolved, That two hundred and fifty copies of the Petition, and of these Resolutions, be printed and circulated; and that the Committee appointed last year are requested to procure subscriptions for defraying the necessary expenses.

Resolved, That the respectful thanks of this Meeting be returned to the Duke of Sussex, to Sir Henry Parnell, and Sir J. Newport, for presenting the Petitions in last session of Parliament, and for their support of them.

Resolved, That thanks be returned to the Earl of Carysfort, Sir Samuel Romilly,

F f